

REMARKS

By this response, Applicants have amended claims 26, 38, 45 and 47-50 and have canceled claim 46. As a result, claims 26-45 and 47-50 remain pending in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 38, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Challenger *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,212), hereafter “Challenger.” Claims 26, 27 and 29-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Huynh *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,976,656), hereafter “Huynh.” Claims 29, 31-33, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Challenger in view of Lakritz (U.S. Patent No. 6,623,529), hereafter “Lakritz.” Claims 36, 37, 39, 40 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Challenger in view of Lakritz.

INDICATION OF ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Office objects to claim 28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants gratefully appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter and have amended claim 26 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 28. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 36 and 45 in an attempt to include the subject matter of claim 28 that the Office deems allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable as currently constituted.

CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Hunter E. Webb". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Hunter E. Webb, Reg. No. 54,593

Dated: October 24, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile